

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

**REMARKS**

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 15 have been amended to further define the invention. Claim 4 was amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

**1. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite for use of the phrase "Link 16-like terminals," because it renders the scope of the claims unascertainable.

Claims 6 and 10 have been amended to recite "spread spectrum tactical data terminals" and delete the phrase "Link 16-like." Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 and 10 are now definite. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

**2. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-2 and 7-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranger et al. ("Ranger," U.S. Patent No. 6,393,568). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 15 have been amended to further define the invention.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a translator for use with a first wireless network and a second wireless network and requires, among other limitations, the translator including a first translator terminal communicating with the first terminals of the first

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

wireless network in the first encrypted format, the translator including a second translator terminal communicating with the second terminals of the second wireless network in the second encrypted format or in the non-encrypted format and the translator communicating selected information between the first network and the second network.

Amended independent claim 8 is directed to a method of communicating in a communication network with a first secure wireless network including first terminals and a second secure wireless network including second terminals and requires, among other limitations, translating selected data in the first format to translated data in the second format using a translator having a first translator terminal and a second translator terminal and communicating the translated data to the second terminals.

Amended independent claim 15 is directed to a communication system and requires, among other limitations, a first means for communicating radio signals in a first encrypted format, a second means for communicating radio signals in a second encrypted format or in a non-encrypted format and a translator means including a first translator terminal for communicating with the first means in the first encrypted format, a second translator terminal for communicating with the second terminals in the second encrypted format and communicating selected data between the first means and the second means.

In contrast, Ranger does not teach or suggest a translator for use with first and second wireless networks that includes a first translator terminal communicating with the first terminals of the first wireless network in the first encrypted format, a second translator terminal communicating with the second terminals of the second wireless network in the second encrypted format or in the non-encrypted format and that communicates selected information between the first network and the second network. Rather, Ranger discloses an encryption and decryption system that provides content analysis, such as detection of a computer virus, through a content inspection mechanism. See Ranger, Abstract, Figures 1-4, col. 1, lines 58-61 and col. 2, lines 24-29. Ranger shows a single computer system that receives incoming data. See Ranger, Figures 1, 3 and 4. In one embodiment, a cryptographic algorithm 10 launches a content inspection application 18 (e.g., a virus detection program) that analyzes data decrypted by the cryptographic algorithm 10. See Ranger, Figure 1, col. 3,

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

lines 29-33, lines 36-39, lines 47-54 and lines 62-65. In another embodiment, the content inspection application 18 can launch a decryption algorithm if incoming data or stored data is determined to be encrypted. See Ranger, Figure 3, col. 5, lines 23-39. A computer in the network or perimeter guard computer of the network can use the content inspection application 18 to analyze/scan files or data stored on the computer or computers of the network. See Ranger, Figures 2 and 4, col. 4, lines 1-11. The cryptographic application or determines whether a file is encrypted (block 30) and decrypts the encrypted files (blocks 32 and 3). See Ranger, col. 4, lines 13-15. If the data is not encrypted (block 30) or once the data is decrypted (block 36), the virus detection application is launched to analyze the decrypted data to determine whether a virus is present (blocks 40 and 42). See Ranger, Figure 2, col. 4, lines 13-15 and lines 30-37. Alternatively, files may be inspected on a per file basis upon receipt of the incoming data. See Ranger, col. 4, lines 44-47. The disclosed system allows data that has been encrypted to be analyzed for detection of a virus. See Ranger, col. 1, lines 58-61, col. 2, line 67 to col. 3, line 4 and col. 3, lines 62-65. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are believed to be allowable.

Further, Ranger does not does not disclose or identify the problem of integrating two or more secure wireless networks that utilize different encryption formats. Rather, as discussed above, Ranger deals with providing content analysis, such as detection of a computer virus, in encrypted information. See Ranger, col. 1, lines 58-61. Ranger is not concerned with problems encountered with communicating secured data in different formats.

Claims 2 and 7 depend from amended claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Ranger for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 1.

Claims 9-14 depend from amended claim 8 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 8 and are therefore allowable over Ranger for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 8.

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

Claims 16-20 depend from amended claim 15 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 15 and are therefore allowable over Ranger for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 15.

Accordingly, claims 1-2 and 7-20 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1-2 and 7-20 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranger in view of Frink ("Frink, U.S. Patent No. 4,870,571). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 3-6 depend from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Ranger in view of Frink for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-6 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 3-6 is respectfully requested.

Atty. Dkt. No. 99CR021/KE

**3. Conclusion**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 24, 2003By Kyle Eppele

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.  
Intellectual Property Department  
400 Collins Road, NE, M/S 124-323  
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52498  
Telephone: (319) 295-8280  
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777  
Customer No.: 26383

Kyle Eppele  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,155